



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,774	12/03/2003	Mario E. Bran	VERTE.32CPCCC1D	4205
34132	7590	04/07/2005	EXAMINER	
COZEN O'CONNOR, P.C. 1900 MARKET STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-3508			EL ARINI, ZEINAB	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/726,774

Applicant(s)

BRAN, MARIO E.

Examiner

Zeinab E. EL-Arini

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2005 and 02 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Application/Control Number:
10/726,774
Art Unit: 1746

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment and remarks filed 01/07/05 and 02/02/05 have been acknowledged and entered.

The objection to the abstract and title stated in paper No. 100504 has been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

The rejections under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, and the 102 (b) rejection stated in paper No. 100504 have been withdrawn in view of applicant's remarks and amendment.

The ODP rejections over 6,463,938, 6,295,999, and 6,679,272 in paper No.100504 have been withdrawn in view of the disclaimed.

Also the ODP rejection over application 10/059,682 has been withdrawn because claim 21 has been withdrawn from said application.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA

1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 5-8, and 10-11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 34-35, and 37 of copending Application No. 10/760,596.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the

methods as claimed in both applications are functionally equivalent.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1 and 5, “generally horizontal” is indefinite term, because “generally” cannot be used to negate the term which they modify. See *Arvin Industries v. Berns Air King Corp.* 188 USPQ 49 (CCPA 1975).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1 -11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 354069260A (JP'260).

JP'260 a method of cleaning a flat substrate comprising supporting the substrate, transmitting sonic energy to the substrate while flowing liquid onto both sides of the substrate to loosen the particles as claimed. See the abstract, and Figs. 1-2. JP'260 does not teach horizontal orientation.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use JP'260 to obtain the claimed process. This is because the substrate taught by JP'260, at some point during rotation, will be in generally horizontal orientation. Also the transmitter at some point during rotating the substrate

will be adjacent to one side which could be the upper side. Also regarding the vibration, one skilled in the art would adjust the frequency to obtain optimum results.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argument with respect to JP'260 does not teach the horizontal orientation, is unpersuasive, because JP'260 substrate at some point during rotating, will be at generally horizontal orientation as claimed.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zeinab E. EL-Arini whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Application/Control Number:
10/726,774
Art Unit: 1746

Page 7

1301. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number:
10/726,774
Art Unit: 1746

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Zeinab E. EL-Arini
Zeinab E. EL-Arini
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1746

ZEE

04/04/05